REMARKS

Please cancel Claim 16 without prejudice. Claims 1-15 and 17-22 are pending. Claims 1, 4 and 15 are amended.

Specification

The specification is objected to for reasons cited in the instant Office Action. The specification is amended to address the objection.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to for reasons cited in the instant Office Action. Claim 4 is amended to address the objection.

Double Patenting

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/791,241. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321 is being submitted concurrent with the instant response, thereby obviating the double patenting rejection.

102 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by De et al. ("De;" U.S. Patent Application No. 6,100,751). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-8 is not shown or suggested by De.

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to an apparatus that includes "a device under test adapted to receive a body bias voltage ..., wherein said device under test is subject to a burn-in test temperature that is regulated by adjusting said body bias voltage." Beginning at line 53 in column 14, Applicants understand De to describe that switching speed is a function of body bias voltage, and that the switching speed increases as the body bias voltage increases to an inflection point, and then switching speed starts to decrease with increasing body bias voltage. According to De, the body bias voltage corresponding to the inflection point is a function of temperature. In other words, according to De, for a given temperature, a body bias voltage can be selected to achieve a desired inflection point. At best, Applicants respectfully submit that De only describes controlling a switching speed inflection point by adjusting body bias voltage. However, Applicants respectfully submit that, in contrast to the present claimed invention, De does not show or suggest controlling device temperature by adjusting body bias voltage.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that De does not show or suggest "a device under test adapted to receive a body bias voltage ..., wherein said device under test is subject to a burn-in test temperature that is regulated by adjusting said body bias voltage" as recited in independent Claim 1. Claims 2-8 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and are in condition for allowance.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 9-15 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De in view of Hashinaga et al. ("Hashinaga;" U.S. Patent Application No. 5,406,212). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 9-15 and 17-22 is not shown or suggested by De and Hashinaga, alone or in combination.

Independent Claim 9 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to "A method of burn-in testing of a device under test, said method comprising ... applying a body bias voltage to said device under test, wherein said body bias voltage is selected to achieve a particular test temperature measured at said device under test." Claims 10-14 are dependent on Claim 9 and recite additional limitations.

Independent Claim 15 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to an apparatus that includes "a wiring board comprising circuitry that individually couples each device under test to said voltage supply such that each device under test can receive a different body bias voltage, wherein a body bias voltage applied to a device under test is selected to achieve a particular test temperature measured at said device under test." Claims 17-22 are dependent on Claim 15 and recite additional limitations.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that, in contrast to the present claimed invention, De does not show or suggest controlling device

temperature by adjusting body bias voltage. Applicants further submit that Hashinaga does not overcome the shortcomings of De. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Hashinaga, alone or in combination with De, does not show or suggest "A method of burn-in testing of a device under test, said method comprising ... applying a body bias voltage to said device under test, wherein said body bias voltage is selected to achieve a particular test temperature measured at said device under test" as recited in independent Claim 9 nor "a wiring board comprising circuitry that individually couples each device under test to said voltage supply such that each device under test can receive a different body bias voltage, wherein a body bias voltage applied to a device under test is selected to achieve a particular test temperature measured at said device under test" as recited in independent Claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 9 and 15 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are in condition for allowance. Applicants also respectfully submit that Claims 10-14 and 17-22, by virtue of their dependency on Claims 9 and 15, respectively, traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-15 and 17-22 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,119,337; 5,844,429; 6,037,792; 6,104,061; 6,114,866; 6,157,201; 6,137,301; 6,218,892; 6,262,588 and 6,310,485.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 12/1/04

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060